Navigating Free Speech in the Digital Era: An Exploration of the "Imminent Lawless Action" Standard

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

September 30, 2023

In a world where every individual wields the power to communicate instantaneously to a global audience, the boundaries of free speech have never been more crucial or contested. The "Imminent Lawless Action" standard, a seminal doctrine in U.S. free speech jurisprudence originating from the Brandenburg v. Ohio decision, has long served as a bulwark against the curtailment of expression. But as we advance further into the digital age, marked by social media's dominance and the rapid dissemination of information, does this half-century-old standard hold its ground? This paper delves into the origins, evolution, and current implications of the "Imminent Lawless Action" doctrine, especially in the context of today's interconnected world, providing insights into the challenges and nuances of safeguarding free expression in our contemporary digital landscape.

Keywords: Imminent Lawless Action, Brandenburg v. Ohio, free speech, First Amendment, digital age, social media, U.S. jurisprudence, freedom of expression, online communication, Section 230, digital communication, constitutional law, hate speech, legal standards.

Introduction

Freedom of speech, enshrined in the First Amendment of the United States Constitution, remains one of the foundational pillars upon which American democracy is built. Yet, as with all freedoms, it is not absolute. Determining the precise boundaries of this right, especially in scenarios that tread the delicate balance between individual expression and societal safety, has been a longstanding endeavor of U.S. courts. Central to this exploration is the "Imminent Lawless Action" standard, a pivotal legal doctrine that delineates when speech can be justifiably restricted without infringing upon constitutional rights.

The significance of this standard is manifold. It not only dictates the legal parameters of permissible speech but also reflects the broader philosophical and societal values that America upholds. As the nation has navigated various challenges, from political upheavals to the digital revolution, the "Imminent Lawless Action" doctrine has served as a compass, guiding judgments and shaping public discourse.

This paper aims to offer an in-depth exploration of this legal standard. Structured in a sequential and thematic manner, we will first delve into the historical context that necessitated the birth of the standard, followed by a detailed examination of its establishment and key provisions. Further, we will venture into its practical applications, its critiques, and its place in the modern digital landscape. Through this journey, our objective is to shed light on the enduring relevance and significance of the "Imminent Lawless Action" standard and its role in safeguarding the cherished American value of free expression while simultaneously addressing the imperatives of public safety and order.

Historical Antecedents of Free Speech Limitations

The tapestry of free speech protections in the United States is intricately woven with threads of historical, political, and societal contexts. While the First Amendment, ratified in 1791, proudly declares that "Congress shall make no law... abridging the freedom of speech," the practical interpretation and application of this principle have been a complex dance of evolution, particularly when faced with perceived threats to national security or public order.

Early American Landscape:

The birth of the United States was in itself a revolutionary act, an assertion against perceived tyranny and a championing of individual rights. In this fervent climate, the sanctity of free speech was seen as a bulwark against potential governmental overreach. However, the nascent Republic also grappled with defining the scope and limitations of this right. The Sedition Act of 1798, for instance, made it a crime to publish "false, scandalous, and malicious writing" against the government or its officials, reflecting early tensions between unrestricted speech and concerns about the stability of the new nation.

The Road to "Clear and Present Danger":

As the nation matured, so did its understanding of free speech and its limitations. The 20th century, with the backdrop of World Wars and the Red Scare, witnessed a series of legal cases that pushed the boundaries of First Amendment protections. The Espionage Act of 1917 and its 1918 amendment, the Sedition Act, for example, penalized those who obstructed the war effort, leading to numerous convictions. It was against this backdrop that Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr., in Schenck v. United States (1919), articulated the "clear and present danger" test. The central question became: Does the speech in question pose a clear and immediate danger to the nation's security or public order?

Interwar Period and the Expansion of Restrictions:

The period between the World Wars further tested the resilience of free speech protections. Cases like Gitlow v. New York (1925) and Whitney v. California (1927) saw the courts upholding convictions of individuals advocating for the overthrow of the government, even if their speech did not necessarily result in direct action. The fear of communism and radical ideologies acted as a backdrop to these rulings, emphasizing a willingness to curb speech seen as threatening to the fabric of American society.

In this tumultuous journey, the American legal system constantly grappled with two competing imperatives: preserving the essential freedom of speech, a cornerstone of democratic values, while ensuring the security and stability of the nation. These early endeavors to strike a balance laid the groundwork for the eventual emergence of the "Imminent Lawless Action" standard, a more refined tool in the judiciary's arsenal to delineate the contours of protected speech.

The "Clear and Present Danger" Era

The phrase "clear and present danger" has become emblematic of a pivotal era in U.S. free speech jurisprudence. This test, aiming to delineate when speech could be curtailed without violating First Amendment protections, emerged as a cornerstone principle during the early 20th century, shaping several key court decisions and offering a lens through which the nation viewed potential threats to its stability.

Origins of the Test:

The genesis of the "clear and present danger" test can be attributed to Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr. during his opinion in the landmark case Schenck v. United States (1919). Charles Schenck, the Secretary of the Socialist Party of America, had

been convicted for distributing anti-draft leaflets during World War I. Holmes, in his ruling, postulated that speech could be restricted if it posed a "clear and present danger" to significant government interests, such as the war effort. He famously drew an analogy to the act of falsely shouting fire in a crowded theater, emphasizing that certain forms of speech could be so immediately hazardous that they warranted restriction.

Significance of the Test:
The "clear and present danger" test marked a significant shift in the way the judiciary approached free speech cases. It introduced an element of immediacy and palpable threat. Instead of merely assessing the content of speech, courts now had to weigh its potential consequences against the backdrop of the prevailing societal and political context. This test, therefore, allowed for a more dynamic and nuanced approach to First Amendment rights, ensuring that speech was protected unless it posed an immediate and discernible threat to vital national interests.

Limitations and Criticisms:
While the "clear and present danger" test was groundbreaking, it wasn't without its limitations and detractors:

1. **Ambiguity:** The terms "clear" and "present" were inherently subjective. What constituted an immediate and obvious danger in one context might not in another. This ambiguity sometimes led to inconsistent applications of the test.
2. **Overreach:** The early applications of the test, especially during times of national crisis or war, often favored government interests over individual rights. Cases like Debs v. United States (1919), where Socialist leader Eugene V. Debs was convicted for an anti-war speech, reflected a tendency to err on the side of caution, sometimes at the expense of robust free speech protections.

3. **Evolving Interpretations:** The test underwent various interpretations over the years. The case of Abrams v. United States (1919) saw Justice Holmes, along with Justice Brandeis, offering a more protective stance on speech in their dissenting opinion, advocating for restriction only if the speech posed an imminent threat to government operations.

The "clear and present danger" test, though monumental, was a product of its times. As America moved through varying societal and political landscapes, the need for a more precise and robust standard became evident. This need eventually paved the way for the "Imminent Lawless Action" test, which sought to address some of the limitations of its predecessor and offer a more definitive framework for evaluating the permissibility of speech.

Brandenburg v. Ohio: A Watershed Moment

The Brandenburg v. Ohio case, decided in 1969, stands as a pivotal juncture in the evolution of U.S. free speech jurisprudence. This landmark decision not only challenged established norms regarding the limitation of speech but also introduced the "Imminent Lawless Action" test, which remains a cornerstone of First Amendment interpretation to this day.

Factual Background:

The case revolved around Clarence Brandenburg, a leader of a Ku Klux Klan faction in Ohio. In 1964, Brandenburg invited a reporter from a Cincinnati news station to cover a KKK rally in Hamilton County. At the rally, participants donned traditional KKK garb, burned crosses, and engaged in inflammatory speeches against African Americans and Jews. Brandenburg himself made statements about the possibility of "revengeance" against the government if it continued to "suppress the white, Caucasian race." Following the broadcast of the event, Brandenburg was

charged and convicted under an Ohio criminal syndicalism law, which prohibited advocating violence or assembling to promote the overthrow of the government.

Arguments Before the Court:

- **State of Ohio's Position:** The state argued that Brandenburg's speech, due to its inflammatory nature, fell outside the protections of the First Amendment. The Ohio law, according to the state, served a significant interest in preventing the incitement of violence and maintaining public order.
- **Brandenburg's Position:** Brandenburg contended that the Ohio law was overly broad and violated his First Amendment rights. He argued that his speech, while controversial, did not directly incite any unlawful actions or violence.

Decision:
In a unanimous per curiam (by the court) decision, the U.S. Supreme Court overturned Brandenburg's conviction. The Court held that the Ohio law's failure to differentiate between the advocacy of the use of force or law violation and the actual incitement to imminent lawless action made it unconstitutional. The Court established the now-famous "Imminent Lawless Action" test, asserting that the state cannot constitutionally prohibit speech unless such speech is "directed to inciting or producing imminent lawless action and is likely to incite or produce such action."

This new standard emphasized two critical elements: the immediacy of the potential lawless action and the likelihood that the speech would produce such an outcome.

Significance and Implications:
The Brandenburg decision radically reshaped the landscape of

free speech protections in the U.S. By introducing a more stringent criterion for speech restriction, the Court reinforced the idea that even extremist or unpopular views are protected under the First Amendment, unless they pose a clear, immediate, and probable threat of causing harm. This decision recalibrated the balance between individual free speech rights and societal interests, firmly prioritizing the former unless faced with immediate and tangible threats.

Furthermore, Brandenburg v. Ohio has had enduring relevance, with its principles being invoked in numerous subsequent cases, underscoring its foundational role in shaping modern American free speech jurisprudence.

Unpacking the "Imminent Lawless Action" Standard

The "Imminent Lawless Action" standard, born out of the Brandenburg v. Ohio decision, has become a touchstone in U.S. First Amendment jurisprudence. Representing a significant shift from earlier free speech tests, this standard offers a more precise and stringent framework for determining when speech can be legitimately curtailed without infringing upon constitutional rights.

Definition of the Standard:

At its core, the "Imminent Lawless Action" test seeks to protect speech unless it meets specific criteria that warrant restriction. For speech to be outside the protection of the First Amendment under this standard, it must be aimed at producing imminent unlawful conduct and must be likely to achieve this objective. Unlike its predecessor, the "clear and present danger" test, this standard emphasizes not just the potential harm but also the immediacy and likelihood of that harm occurring.

The Two-Pronged Test:
Breaking down the "Imminent Lawless Action" standard, we find a two-pronged test, both of which must be satisfied for speech to be restricted:

1. **Direction and Immediacy:** The speech in question must be directed at inciting or producing imminent lawless action. This emphasizes that the potential harm must be immediate or impending. It's not enough for the speech to advocate for illegality in the abstract or at some undefined point in the future; there must be a pressing urgency to the potential lawless outcome.
2. **Probability of Outcome:** The speech must be likely to result in the incitement or production of such unlawful actions. This prong assesses the realistic potential of the speech to achieve the undesirable outcome. Even if speech advocates for unlawful actions, if it's unlikely to achieve such results, it remains protected.

Analytical Implications:
The introduction of this standard marked a pivotal departure from previous, more nebulous tests. By emphasizing immediacy and likelihood, the "Imminent Lawless Action" test:

- **Protects Controversial Speech:** By setting a high bar for speech restriction, the standard ensures that merely controversial, unpopular, or provocative speech isn't silenced.
- **Reduces Subjectivity:** By providing clear criteria, it offers a more objective tool for courts to analyze potentially incendiary speech, reducing the influence of external biases or prevailing societal sentiments.
- **Balances Individual Rights and Societal Safety:** While robustly defending the sanctity of free speech, the test also acknowledges the state's role in ensuring public safety and

order, ensuring a harmonious balance between individual rights and broader societal needs.

In essence, the "Imminent Lawless Action" standard stands as a testament to the U.S. judiciary's commitment to vigorously protecting free speech while recognizing the very real imperatives of maintaining public order and security. By clearly demarcating the boundaries of protected speech, it offers both a shield and a guidepost in the complex realm of First Amendment rights.

Judicial Interpretations: Subsequent Cases and Clarifications

The "Imminent Lawless Action" standard, as established in Brandenburg v. Ohio, laid the groundwork for how speech could be evaluated in the context of potential incitement. However, as with any legal doctrine, its application and interpretation were tested, refined, and clarified through subsequent cases. These cases provided tangible scenarios for courts to grapple with the nuances of the standard, ensuring its vitality and adaptability to changing societal contexts.

Hess v. Indiana (1973):

One of the most significant cases following Brandenburg was Hess v. Indiana. At the heart of this case was Gregory Hess's statement during a protest: "We'll take the streets later (or again)." While the state of Indiana interpreted this as an immediate call to violence, the U.S. Supreme Court disagreed. The Court held that Hess's words did not advocate imminent lawless action. The speech was directed at an unspecified future time and lacked the immediacy that the "Imminent Lawless Action" test required. This case underscored the importance of the immediacy prong, emphasizing that vague or future-oriented advocacy doesn't meet the threshold for restriction.

NAACP v. Claiborne Hardware Co. (1982):
In a dispute over a boycott organized by the NAACP against white merchants, the question arose whether the advocacy of a boycott amounted to inciting imminent lawless action. The Supreme Court ruled in favor of the NAACP, stating that while their speech might have encouraged the boycott, it did not directly lead to any violence or "imminent lawless action." This case showcased the need for a tangible, direct link between speech and potential unlawful conduct for First Amendment protections to be bypassed.

Brandenburg Test in the Modern Context:
While Hess and Claiborne are among the most notable cases post-Brandenburg, the standard has been invoked in various scenarios, from challenges around hate speech to questions about the role of digital platforms in potential incitement. The rise of the internet and social media has introduced new complexities in evaluating the immediacy and likelihood of speech leading to lawless action.

For instance, while not directly a case about the "Imminent Lawless Action" test, Elonis v. United States (2015) explored threats made over Facebook, indicating the Court's growing awareness of the challenges posed by online communication. Although the case primarily revolved around the intent behind the threats, it showcased the judiciary's evolving approach to speech in the digital era.

Key Takeaways:
The consistent thread running through these cases is the judiciary's commitment to upholding the robust protection that the "Imminent Lawless Action" standard offers. Courts have consistently emphasized both prongs of the test, ensuring that speech is protected unless there's a clear, immediate, and probable danger of it inciting unlawful conduct. The adaptability of

the Brandenburg test, as seen through its application in various contexts, cements its foundational role in U.S. free speech jurisprudence.

Comparative Analysis: Other Jurisdictions and Standards

The United States' approach to free speech, anchored by the "Imminent Lawless Action" standard, provides a unique lens to understand the balance between individual rights and societal imperatives. However, when juxtaposed against the free speech limitations in other democracies, it paints a broader picture of global free speech jurisprudence and the varied ways in which countries navigate this delicate balance.

United Kingdom:

The UK, lacking a written constitution like the U.S., relies on the Human Rights Act of 1998, which incorporates the European Convention on Human Rights. Article 10 of the Convention ensures freedom of expression but also allows for restrictions in the interests of national security, territorial integrity, or public safety. The UK's approach, especially with laws against hate speech and its broader definition of incitement, is generally perceived as more restrictive than the U.S.

Canada:

Canada's Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees freedom of speech under Section 2(b). However, Section 1 allows for reasonable limits on this right if demonstrably justified in a free society. The landmark case R v. Keegstra (1990) upheld a conviction for promoting hatred against an identifiable group, showcasing Canada's willingness to limit speech that could harm societal cohesion.

Germany:
Post World War II, Germany has been particularly vigilant about hate speech and Nazi propaganda. The German Basic Law ensures freedom of expression but allows for restrictions to protect the democratic order or the rights of others. Laws in Germany are more proactive in curbing hate speech, reflective of its historical context.

India:
Article 19(1)(a) of the Indian Constitution guarantees freedom of speech and expression, but it is not absolute. Clause (2) of the same article allows for "reasonable restrictions" on grounds of sovereignty, security, public order, and more. Landmark cases, such as Shreya Singhal v. Union of India (2015), have grappled with these limits, particularly in the context of the digital age.

Australia:
Australia lacks a national Bill of Rights, making its free speech framework rooted more in common law. While freedom of speech is recognized, especially in the context of political communication, there are laws related to defamation, hate speech, and racial vilification that place limits on unfettered expression.

Key Insights:

1. **Varying Emphasis on Individual vs. Societal Rights:** While the U.S., through the "Imminent Lawless Action" standard, places a robust emphasis on individual rights, other countries might lean more towards societal harmony or public order.
2. **Historical Context Matters:** Countries like Germany, bearing the weight of their histories, might have stricter standards to prevent societal harm or the resurgence of past horrors.

3. **Balancing Act:** Irrespective of the jurisdiction, the common thread is the challenge of striking a balance between protecting free expression and ensuring societal stability, safety, and harmony.

In conclusion, the U.S.'s "Imminent Lawless Action" standard provides a distinctive approach, offering robust protection to speech. However, in the global context, it becomes evident that each nation's free speech jurisprudence is a reflection of its unique historical, cultural, and societal milieu. While methods differ, the shared goal remains the harmonization of individual rights and collective well-being.

Critiques and Counterarguments

The "Imminent Lawless Action" standard, while pivotal in safeguarding free speech rights, hasn't been without its detractors. Over the years, scholars, jurists, and social commentators have both praised and critiqued its approach. Here, we examine some of the primary criticisms of the standard and the counterarguments that have been presented in its defense.

Critiques:

1. **Vagueness and Ambiguity:** One of the main criticisms is that terms like "imminent" and "likely" can be subjective, leading to potential inconsistencies in application. Critics argue that such ambiguity can chill free speech, with individuals uncertain about where the boundaries lie.
2. **Overly Permissive:** Some believe that the standard, with its focus on immediacy, could allow for dangerous rhetoric to persist unchecked as long as no immediate action is incited.

This, they argue, could foster a hostile environment where inflammatory speech becomes normalized.

3. **Inadequate for the Digital Age:** Given the instantaneous nature of online communication and the viral spread of information, some critics contend that the "Imminent Lawless Action" standard might not adequately address the nuances of the digital era. A speech might not incite immediate action in a physical setting but could rapidly mobilize individuals online.
4. **Potential for Judicial Overreach:** The standard's reliance on the judiciary to determine what constitutes "imminent" and "likely" can, critics argue, lead to potential overreach or bias, particularly during times of societal unrest or tension.

Counterarguments:

1. **Necessary Flexibility:** Proponents argue that the inherent ambiguity in terms like "imminent" and "likely" offers the judiciary the necessary flexibility to adapt the standard to varied scenarios, ensuring its continued relevance.
2. **Robust Protection of Speech:** The standard's perceived permissiveness is, for many, its strength. By setting a high bar for restricting speech, it ensures that only the most dangerous expressions, those posing an immediate and probable threat, are curtailed.
3. **Adaptability to Changing Contexts:** While the digital age presents new challenges, proponents believe the "Imminent Lawless Action" standard can evolve. Courts can interpret and apply the doctrine considering contemporary realities, as seen in recent cases around online threats or incitement.
4. **Checks and Balances:** Advocates emphasize that the standard operates within a broader system of checks and balances. While the judiciary plays a pivotal role, precedent, peer review, and potential for higher court appeals ensure that the standard is applied consistently and judiciously.

In conclusion, while the "Imminent Lawless Action" standard has its critics, it remains a foundational doctrine in U.S. free speech jurisprudence. Its ability to weather critiques, adapt to changing societal contexts, and strike a balance between individual rights and societal imperatives underscores its enduring significance and relevance.

Implications for Modern America: Digital Age and Social Media

In an era where digital platforms dominate public discourse and social media acts as a primary communication tool for billions, the "Imminent Lawless Action" standard finds itself in uncharted waters. The vast reach, immediacy, and sometimes anonymous nature of online communication present new challenges and nuances that could not have been anticipated when the standard was first established.

Speed and Reach of Communication:

The most significant distinction between traditional and digital communication is the sheer speed and reach that online platforms offer. A statement, image, or video can go viral within hours, reaching millions across the globe. This raises questions about the "imminence" of potential harm. If a provocative tweet can inspire a protest or rally within hours, does it meet the criteria of inciting "imminent lawless action"?

Anonymity and Echo Chambers:

The internet provides a level of anonymity, emboldening individuals to make statements they might shy away from in a physical, identifiable setting. Moreover, the formation of online echo chambers, where individuals only engage with like-minded individuals, can amplify extremist views without the tempering influence of counterarguments. This poses a challenge: How do

we determine the "likelihood" of such speech leading to lawless action when it's continuously reinforced within a bubble?

Role of Social Media Platforms:
Platforms like Meta (formerly Facebook), Twitter, and YouTube play a dual role. While they act as facilitators of free speech, they also wield significant power in moderating content. Their decisions to allow or remove content can impact public discourse.

Section 230 and the Shielding of Platforms:
Central to discussions around online speech and harm is Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act. This provision, often regarded as the internet's First Amendment, provides online platforms with immunity from liability for content posted by users. Companies like Meta escape claims of harm due to this provision. While Section 230 was crafted to promote online innovation and free expression, critics argue it lets platforms off the hook for propagating harmful content.

However, the counterargument is that holding platforms liable for user-generated content could stifle free expression. They might become overly cautious, removing any content that poses even a remote risk of litigation. This, in turn, could infringe on users' First Amendment rights.

Adapting the "Imminent Lawless Action" Standard:
Given the unique challenges of the digital age, there's a growing debate about whether the "Imminent Lawless Action" standard needs reinterpretation. While the essence of the standard remains valid, its application in the online context requires nuanced understanding. For instance, courts might need to factor in the virality potential of content, the role of algorithms in amplifying extreme views, or the influence of digital mobs that can be mobilized rapidly.

In conclusion, the digital age, marked by the omnipresence of social media, necessitates a fresh appraisal of established free speech doctrines. While the "Imminent Lawless Action" standard offers a robust framework, its application in the interconnected, instantaneous world of the internet will require judicial wisdom, foresight, and adaptability. The challenge lies in preserving the sanctity of free speech while recognizing and mitigating the unique threats posed by the digital realm.

Conclusion

The "Imminent Lawless Action" standard stands as a beacon in U.S. free speech jurisprudence, a testament to the nation's unwavering commitment to protecting the sacrosanct right to free expression. Born out of the turbulent era of the 1960s and grounded in the watershed Brandenburg v. Ohio decision, this standard emerged as a nuanced response to the age-old tension between individual rights and societal imperatives.

Through the course of this paper, we journeyed from the early antecedents of free speech limitations, where broad strokes like the "clear and present danger" test laid the groundwork. The gradual refinement led to the introduction of the "Imminent Lawless Action" doctrine, a standard that set a high bar for any curtailment of speech, demanding both immediacy and a high probability of ensuing harm.

However, like any legal doctrine, the standard hasn't existed in a vacuum. Subsequent judicial interpretations have tested, prodded, and refined it. Cases like Hess v. Indiana provided clarity, emphasizing the importance of immediacy, while the broader global comparison highlighted the uniqueness of the

American approach amidst a mosaic of international free speech paradigms.

But perhaps the most pressing challenge to this doctrine arises from the digital epoch we currently inhabit. The age of social media, with its unparalleled reach and immediacy, poses questions that the framers of the standard could scarcely have imagined. Platforms like Meta, operating under the protective umbrella of provisions like Section 230, further complicate the landscape, raising questions about responsibility and accountability in the digital realm.

As we look to the horizon, the trajectory of the "Imminent Lawless Action" standard is poised on the knife-edge of legal adaptability. While its core principles remain as relevant today as they were half a century ago, their application in our interconnected, digital world will demand a blend of judicial wisdom, technological understanding, and an unwavering commitment to the foundational values of free expression.

In the end, the enduring legacy of the "Imminent Lawless Action" standard will not just be in its past judgments, but in its ability to evolve, adapt, and guide the nation through the uncharted waters of the digital future, ensuring that the flame of free speech burns bright, even in the face of new-age challenges.

Bibliography/References

1. **Primary Sources (Cases):**
    - Brandenburg v. Ohio, 395 U.S. 444 (1969).
    - Schenck v. United States, 249 U.S. 47 (1919).
    - Whitney v. California, 274 U.S. 357 (1927).
    - Hess v. Indiana, 414 U.S. 105 (1973).

- NAACP v. Claiborne Hardware Co., 458 U.S. 886 (1982).
- Elonis v. United States, 575 U.S. 723 (2015).
- R v. Keegstra, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 697.

2. **Books & Articles:**
   - Stone, Geoffrey R. *Perilous Times: Free Speech in Wartime from the Sedition Act of 1798 to the War on Terrorism*. W.W. Norton & Company, 2004.
   - Sunstein, Cass R. *Democracy and the Problem of Free Speech*. Free Press, 1995.
   - Siegel, Paul. "Protecting political speech: Brandenburg vs. Ohio updated". *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 67(1): 69–80, 1981.
   - Reed, O. Lee. "The state is strong but I am weak: Why the 'imminent lawless action' standard should not apply to targeted speech that threatens individuals with violence". *American Business Law Journal*, 38(1): 177–208, 2000.
   - Pew, Bradley. "How to Incite Crime with Words: Clarifying Brandenburg's Incitement Test with Speech Act Theory". *BYU Law Review*, 2015(4): 1087–1114.
3. **Online Resources:**
   - "Brandenburg test". Wex. Legal Information Institute. [Link]
   - Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act. [Link]
   - European Convention on Human Rights, Article 10. [Link]
4. **Government Publications:**
   - The United States Constitution, First Amendment.
   - The Human Rights Act 1998 (UK).
   - Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.
   - German Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany.
   - The Constitution of India, Article 19(1)(a).